

From: Kirsten Rasanen <[REDACTED]@google.com>
To: Jamie Rosenberg <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Sameer Samat <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Subject: Fwd: [Meeting Summary] Play Payment Policy
Cc: Claire Hart <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Samer Sayigh <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Paul Feng <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Tia Arzu <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Purnima Kochikar <[REDACTED]@google.com>

(smaller group)
ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED

Sameer, Jamie -

During our last discussion on Policy update, we decided to hold for now on making policy updates. You mentioned that you may be able to co-opt some of Hiroshi's 1:1 with Sundar this week to validate our decision. I am assuming that topic is lower priority than others right now and will not be raised to Sundar, but want to ensure that we're all aligned on next steps.

I need to update the broader BD team about our plans as they're anxiously awaiting and have some antsy developers nipping at their heels. We are preparing comms docs for the team to use reactively with most developers and pro-actively when advantageous (eg. Netflix). We will ask that they not communicate out until after 4/25 in case we have additional information following the release of the P2B draft that impacts our messaging.

All comms will be cleared with legal/pr before being disseminated to BD team members or partners.

Can you confirm that you are OK with this plan and nothing has changed on your end?

Thanks,
K



----- Forwarded message -----
From: Samer Sayigh <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Sat, Mar 24, 2018 at 2:59 PM
Subject: [Meeting Summary] Play Payment Policy
To: Jamie Rosenberg <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Sameer Samat <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Tian Lim <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Kirsten Rasanen <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Paul Feng <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Larry Yang <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Tia Arzu <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Danielle Osler <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Cc: Paul Gennai <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Claire Hart <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Wilson White <[REDACTED]@google.com>

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

Hi all -- below is a summary of Friday's policy meeting.

Meeting Outcome & Follow Ups

- Policy change goals are to improve payment UX and ensure ecosystem consistency. Even though we have a defensible plan that achieves goals and made progress with many developers impacted, **the sense is we'll likely not want to trigger Spotify agitation and associated noise with a policy change.** I.e. the risk of likely Spotify agitation may be higher than the (harder to gauge) risk of status quo.

(proposal should be released 4/25 -- we may want to wait until then before taking any action).

- Jamie / Sameer can double check with Sundar, possibly week of 4/2
- Working team to keep Jamie / Sameer informed of risk level of status quo -- e.g. worsening payment UX, and increase in likelihood that Play billing requirement altogether due to app exception
- Working team to determine how best to harness progress with other devs -- e.g. incentives, and/or policy clarification + enforcement around the edges

- **Question: Is it worth one more chat with Spotify to better assess how displeased they'd be if we changed policy, but provided generous grandfathering (e.g. 2-yr and no requirements)? We owe them a response on their grandfathering counterproposal anyhow**

Option Summary (for reference)

Option	Advantage	Key Risk
Remove Exception -Require exclusive GPB integration for all digital IAPs -Provide generous grandfathering (2 yrs; minimal reqs)	Achieves goals: (1) removes policy ambiguity + ensures consistency, (2) improves payment UX Better positions us to respond to increasing regulatory inquiry Can likely onboard majority of Head apps we spoke to (except Spotify)	Google triggers (1) Spotify agitation (likelihood), and associated noise
Keep Exception; Add Requirements	Partially achieves goal of improved payment UX New reqs are defensible	Draws attention to ambiguous excep which may prove hard to justify → contagion
No Policy Change	Google doesn't trigger noise	Regulator may deem exclusive GPB requirement is unnecessary, partly due to current exception More apps de-integrate GPB

Other Notes

If we changed policy and provided 2-yr grandfathering, let's consider:

- Incentives to encourage earlier Play billing adoption
- ATV carveouts for all video devs with existing TV deals
- How best to ensure 1P comply (e.g. Play billing integration + revenue share)

Samer

--

Kirsten Rasanen | Director, Google Play Partnerships | [REDACTED]@google.com | [REDACTED]

Option	Advantage	Key Risk
Remove Exception -Require exclusive GPB integration for all digital IAPs -Provide generous grandfathering (2 yrs; minimal reqs)	Achieves goals: (1) removes policy ambiguity + ensures consistency, (2) improves payment UX Better positions us to respond to increasing regulatory inquiry Can likely onboard majority of Head apps we spoke to (except Spotify)	Google triggers (1) Spotify agitation (high likelihood), and associated noise
Keep Exception; Add Requirements	Partially achieves goal of improved payment UX New reqs are defensible	Draws attention to ambiguous exception, which may prove hard to justify → contagion
No Policy Change	Google doesn't trigger noise	Regulator may deem exclusive GPB requirement is unnecessary, partly due to current exception More apps de-integrate GPB